

Semi-static hedging under exchangeability type conditions

Ilya Molchanov and Michael Schmutz*

Department of Mathematical Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Bern,
Sidlerstrasse 5, 3012 Bern, Switzerland
ilya.molchanov@stat.unibe.ch, michael.schmutz@stat.unibe.ch

Abstract

In this paper we analyse financial implications of exchangeability and similar properties of finite dimensional random vectors. We show how these properties are reflected in prices of some basket options in view of the well-known put-call symmetry property and the duality principle in option pricing. A particular attention is devoted to the case of asset prices driven by Lévy processes. Based on this, concrete semi-static hedging techniques for multi-asset barrier options, such as certain weighted barrier spread options, weighted barrier swap options or weighted barrier quanto-swap options are suggested.

1 Introduction

Following Carr and Lee [11], *semi-static hedging* is the replication of contracts by trading European-style claims at no more than two times after inception. In the *single asset* case such semi-static hedging strategies have been analysed extensively in recent years, see e.g. [2, 3, 8, 9, 10] and more recently [11]. These strategies are usually based on the classic univariate European *put-call symmetry* property (also known as Bates' rule from [5]), relating certain out-of-the money calls and puts in the *same* market, see e.g. [4, 7, 14, 17, 18, 19] and more recently [11].

Interestingly, also the *duality principle* in option pricing traces some of its roots to the same papers as put-call symmetry results, see e.g. [4, 5, 7, 20]. The power of duality lies in the possibility to reduce the complexity of valuation problems by relating them to easier problems in the so-called *dual markets*. For a presentation of this principle in a general univariate exponential semimartingale setting see [12], for bivariate Lévy markets see [15], for multivariate semi-martingale extensions (with various dual-markets) see [13]. The symmetry property then appears if the original and dual markets coincide, that motivates the name *self-dual* chosen in [23] for distributions that coincide with their duals.

*Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation Grant Nr. 200021-117606.

The symmetry properties of option prices eventually boil down to the symmetries of expected payoffs from plain vanilla options, see [11, 23]. For instance, integrable η is self-dual if and only if

$$\mathbf{E}(F\eta - k)_+ = \mathbf{E}(F - k\eta)_+ \quad (1.1)$$

for every strike $k \geq 0$, with F being the forward price. The above put-call symmetry makes it possible to replace at certain times a call option with an equally valued put in order to design semi-static hedges.

Molchanov and Schmutz [23] showed that in the multi-asset case the self-duality property and the corresponding hedge possibilities correspond to symmetries of expected payoffs from basket options. In the multi-asset setting $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ is an n -dimensional random vector with positive coordinates such that the price S_{T_i} of the i th asset at time $T > 0$ equals $F_i\eta_i$, where in a risk-neutral world, F_i stands for the corresponding theoretical *forward price* and η_i for the random part of the price change, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We denote this shortly as

$$S_T = (S_{T_1}, \dots, S_{T_n}) = (F_1\eta_1, \dots, F_n\eta_n) = F \circ \eta.$$

Furthermore, assume that $\mathbf{Q}$ is a probability measure that makes η integrable. The expectation with respect to $\mathbf{Q}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{E}$ without subscript. For further simplicity of notation, we do not write time T as a subscript of η and incorporate for a moment the forward prices F_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, into payoff functions, i.e. payoffs will be real-valued functions of η .

Consider the payoff function for European basket options given by

$$f_b(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n) = \left(\sum_{l=1}^n u_l \eta_l + u_0 \right)_+, \quad u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.2)$$

If we write the “weights” of a basket option together with its strike as a vector, we number the coordinates of the obtained $(n+1)$ -dimensional vectors as $0, 1, \dots, n$ and write these vectors as (u_0, u) for $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or as $(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n) = (u_0, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. In the following we consider vectors as rows or columns depending on the situation.

Since $f_b(u_0, u)$ can be understood as a plain vanilla option on the scalar product $\langle u, \eta \rangle$ with strike u_0 , the corresponding expected payoffs determine uniquely the distribution of $\langle u, \eta \rangle$ (see [6] and [24]). The expected payoffs also determine the distribution of η as the following result shows.

Theorem 1.1 (see [23]). *The expected values $\mathbf{E}f_b(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ for all $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ determine uniquely the distribution $\mathbf{Q}$ of an integrable random vector η .*

Although it is possible to weaken the statement by considering only one fixed $u_0 \neq 0$, the uniqueness does not hold any more if $u_0 = 0$, i.e. for the payoffs

$$f_b^o(u) = \left(\sum_{l=1}^n u_l \eta_l \right)_+ = (\langle u, \eta \rangle)_+, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.3)$$

The random vector η is called *self-dual* with respect to the i th numeraire if η is integrable and $\mathbf{E}f_b(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ as a function of (u_0, u) is invariant with respect to the permutation

of u_0 and the i th coordinate of u , see [23]. A *jointly* self-dual η satisfies this property for all numeraires $i = 1, \dots, n$, so that the expected payoff $\mathbf{E}f_b(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ becomes symmetric in all its $(n + 1)$ arguments. This joint self-duality property implies that η is *exchangeable*, i.e. $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ coincides in distribution with $(\eta_{l_1}, \dots, \eta_{l_n})$ for each permutation $i \mapsto l_i$. The exchangeability property is well studied in probability theory, see e.g. [1] or [21, Sec. 11] and the literature cited therein. It is also known from [23] that the exchangeability property is strictly weaker than the joint self-duality. Theorem 1.1 implies that the exchangeability of an integrable η is equivalent to the invariance of $\mathbf{E}f_b(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ with respect to any permutation of u for any $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

While the self-duality property is crucial to switch between put and call options as in (1.1), hedges for some other derivatives do not rely on the self-duality assumption. In particular, this relates to derivatives with the payoff function (1.3) that appears by setting $u_0 = 0$ in (1.2). For example, one can require that

$$\mathbf{E}(u_1\eta_1 + u_2\eta_2)_+ = \mathbf{E}(u_1\eta_2 + u_2\eta_1)_+, \quad (1.4)$$

for every $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in the two-asset case, or the invariance of $\mathbf{E}f_b^\circ(u)$ with respect to permutations of any two (or given two) coordinates of u in the multivariate case. This is weaker than the exchangeability property of η , e.g. in the risk-neutral setting each two-dimensional log-normally distributed random vector satisfies (1.4), no matter that its coordinates are not identically distributed and so are not exchangeable unless the two assets share the same volatility.

Obvious applications of the described symmetry results may be found in the area of validating models or analysing market data, e.g. similarly as in [5] and [16] in the univariate case. The probably most important applications will be found in the area of hedging, especially in developing semi-static replicating strategies of multi-asset barrier (see Section 6) and possibly also more complicated path-dependent contracts. In cases where we are able to combine the hedging instruments with the duality principle we can first handle a path dependency via symmetry results and then reduce the complexity of the instruments in the hedges by applying duality results, similarly as in [27]. Since the instruments in the hedges should be liquid, the last step could be important for successful implementation, but needs the real existence of dual markets, being typically the case for certain currency derivatives.

We proceed with a concise discussion of the exchangeability property in Section 2. Section 3 deals with a weaker swap-invariance property for swap and quanto-swap options, provides its characterisation and discusses relationships to self-duality. Section 4 analyses log-infinitely divisible distributions, exhibiting the swap-invariance property. The necessity to handle unequal carrying costs motivates further weakening of the swap-invariance property by means of the power transformation in Section 5. Finally Section 6 presents applications for creating semi-static hedges for certain well-known multi-asset derivatives with knocking conditions.

2 Exchangeable random vectors

For each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i \neq j$, define a linear mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\pi_{ij}(x) = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_j, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_i, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n),$$

i.e. π_{ij} transposes (swaps) the i th and j th coordinates of x . The linear mapping π_{ij} can be represented by an orthonormal matrix also denoted by π_{ij} .

If the distribution of η is π_{ij} -invariant, we say that η is *ij-exchangeable*. In view of Theorem 1.1, for *integrable* η this property is equivalent to the invariance of $\mathbf{E}f_b(u_0, u)$ with respect to permutation of the i th and j th coordinates of u for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. The *ij-exchangeability* property implies the equality of the marginal distributions of η_i and η_j .

Since all coordinates of η are positive, $\eta = e^\xi$ for a random vector $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$, where the exponential function is applied coordinatewisely. The *ij-exchangeability* property is equivalent to the π_{ij} -invariance of the distribution of ξ or its characteristic function φ_ξ under $\mathbf{Q}$. In view of the widespread use of Lévy models for derivative pricing we characterise infinitely divisible random vectors $\xi = \log \eta$ for *ij-exchangeable* η . In the sequel we denote the Euclidean norm by $\|\cdot\|$, the imaginary unit $\sqrt{-1}$ by $\mathbf{i}$, and use the following formulation of the *Lévy-Khintchine formula* (see [25, Ch. 2]) for the characteristic function of ξ

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\xi(u) = \mathbf{E}e^{\mathbf{i}\langle u, \xi \rangle} = \exp \left\{ \mathbf{i}\langle \gamma, u \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle u, Au \rangle \right. \\ \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (e^{\mathbf{i}\langle u, x \rangle} - 1 - \mathbf{i}\langle u, x \rangle \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x) \right\}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where A is a symmetric non-negative definite $n \times n$ matrix, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a constant vector and ν is a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (called the Lévy measure) satisfying $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min(\|x\|^2, 1) d\nu(x) < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\eta = e^\xi$ with ξ being infinitely divisible. Then η is *ij-exchangeable* if and only if the generating triplet (A, ν, γ) of ξ satisfies the following conditions.*

- (1) *The matrix $A = (a_{lm})_{l,m=1}^n$ satisfies $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$ and $a_{li} = a_{lj}$ for all $l = 1, \dots, n$, $l \neq i, j$.*
- (2) *The Lévy measure is π_{ij} -invariant, i.e. $\nu(B) = \nu(\pi_{ij}B)$ for all Borel B .*
- (3) *The i th and j th coordinates of γ coincide.*

Proof. It is obvious that η is *ij-exchangeable* if and only if $\varphi_\xi(u)$ is π_{ij} -invariant for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Writing $\varphi_\xi(\pi_{ij}u)$ as (2.1), and using the orthonormality and self-inverse property of π_{ij} along with the π_{ij} -invariance of the Euclidean norm and the uniqueness property of the triplet, we immediately see that $\gamma_i = \gamma_j$, the Lévy measure is π_{ij} -invariant and A commutes

with π_{ij} . The latter means that A is invariant with respect to the swap of its i th and j th rows combined with the subsequent swap of the i th and j th columns, which implies the first condition. $\square$

Remark 2.2 (Exchangeability in several components). It is easy to show that if m coordinates of square integrable ξ are jointly exchangeable, then the correlation coefficient between them is not smaller than $-(m-1)^{-1}$, see also [1].

Example 2.3 (Log-normal distribution, Black–Scholes setting). Assume that $\eta = e^\xi$ is log-normal with ξ having expectation μ and covariance matrix A . Then η is ij -exchangeable if and only if A satisfies $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$ and $a_{li} = a_{lj}$ for $l = 1, \dots, n$, $l \neq i, j$, (with the remaining a_{lm} arbitrarily chosen such that A is nonnegative-definite) and $\mu_i = \mu_j$. The latter automatically holds if all components of η are related to a martingale measure, i.e. $\mu = -\frac{1}{2}(a_{11}, \dots, a_{nn})$. In the *bivariate* risk-neutral case the only restriction is the equality of the variances, while the correlation coefficient between ξ_1 and ξ_2 can be arbitrary.

3 Swap-invariance and its generalisations

Now we consider the symmetry property for the payoff function (1.3) obtained by setting the strike u_0 in (1.2) at zero.

Definition 3.1. An integrable random vector η is said to be *ij-swap-invariant* if the expected value $\mathbf{E}f_b^\circ(u)$ is invariant with respect to swapping the i th and j th coordinates of any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

This property yields that $\mathbf{E}\eta_i = \mathbf{E}\eta_j$, but is clearly weaker than the ij -exchangeability of η .

Define functions $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_j : (0, \infty)^n \mapsto (0, \infty)^{n-1}$ acting as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_j(x) = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_j}, \dots, \frac{x_{j-1}}{x_j}, \frac{x_{j+1}}{x_j}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_j} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The following result shows that ij -swap-invariance is related to the self-duality in a lower-dimensional space.

Theorem 3.2. Let η be $\mathbf{Q}$ -integrable and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i < j$. Then the following two statements are equivalent.

- (I) The n -dimensional random vector η is ij -swap-invariant under $\mathbf{Q}$.
- (II) The $(n-1)$ -dimensional random vector $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_j(\eta)$ is self-dual with respect to the i th numeraire under the probability measure $\mathbf{Q}^j$ defined from

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Q}^j}{d\mathbf{Q}} = \frac{\eta_j}{\mathbf{E}\eta_j}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. The change of measure formula yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}^j} \left(\sum_{l=1, l \neq j}^n u_l \frac{\eta_l}{\eta_j} + u_j \right)_+ &= (\mathbf{E}\eta_j)^{-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{l=1}^n u_l \eta_l \right)_+, \\ \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}^j} \left(\sum_{l=1, l \neq i, j}^n u_l \frac{\eta_l}{\eta_j} + u_i + u_j \frac{\eta_i}{\eta_j} \right)_+ &= (\mathbf{E}\eta_j)^{-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{l=1, l \neq i, j}^n u_l \eta_l + u_i \eta_j + u_j \eta_i \right)_+.\end{aligned}$$

The equality of the right-hand sides characterises the ij -swap-invariance of η , while the equality of the left-hand sides means the self-duality of $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j(\eta)$ with respect to the i th numeraire under $\mathbf{Q}^j$. $\square$

It should be noted that an analogue of condition (II) holds for $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i(\eta)$ under $\mathbf{Q}^i$ with respect to its $(j-1)$ th numeraire.

Example 3.3 (Bivariate swap-invariance and symmetry). Let η be a bivariate swap-invariant random vector with $\mathbf{E}\eta_1 = 1$. Then $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1(\eta) = \eta_2/\eta_1 = \tilde{\eta}$ and

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}^1}(u_1 \tilde{\eta} + u_2)_+ = \mathbf{E}(u_1 \eta_2 + u_2 \eta_1)_+ = \mathbf{E}(u_1 \eta_1 + u_2 \eta_2)_+ = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}^1}(u_1 + u_2 \tilde{\eta})_+,$$

for every $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, (η_1, η_2) is swap-invariant under $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if $\tilde{\eta}$ satisfies classical univariate European put-call symmetry under the “dual-market” measure $\mathbf{Q}^1$.

We now recall the self-duality condition for a random vector. In the sequel $e_1, \dots, e_n$ denote standard basis vectors and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ in the space of an appropriate dimension.

Theorem 3.4 (see [23]). *An integrable random vector $\eta = e^\xi$ with distribution $\mathbf{P}$ is self-dual with respect to the i th numeraire if and only if the characteristic function of ξ (calculated for the distribution $\mathbf{P}$) satisfies*

$$\varphi_\xi^\mathbf{P} \left(u - \mathbf{z}_2^{\frac{1}{2}} e_i \right) = \varphi_\xi^\mathbf{P} \left(K_i^\top u - \mathbf{z}_2^{\frac{1}{2}} e_i \right) \quad (3.2)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $K_i^\top$ is the transposed to the linear operator acting as

$$K_i u = (u_1 - u_i, \dots, u_{i-1} - u_i, -u_i, u_{i+1} - u_i, \dots, u_n - u_i).$$

Theorem 3.5. *An integrable random vector $\eta = e^\xi$ is ij -swap-invariant if and only if the characteristic function of ξ satisfies*

$$\varphi_\xi(u - \mathbf{z}_2^{\frac{1}{2}} e_{ij}) = \varphi_\xi(\pi_{ij} u - \mathbf{z}_2^{\frac{1}{2}} e_{ij}) \quad (3.3)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$, where $e_{ij} = e_i + e_j$ and

$$\mathbb{H} = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{k=1}^n u_k = 0\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, we need to check the self-duality of $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j(\eta)$ with respect to the measure $\mathbf{Q}^j$ from (3.1). Denote $c = \mathbf{E}\eta_j$.

Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j(\eta) = e^{\tilde{\xi}}$ with $\tilde{\xi} = \xi' - \mathbf{1} \xi_j$ and $(n-1)$ -dimensional vector ξ' given by

$$\xi' = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_n).$$

The characteristic function of $\tilde{\xi}$ with respect to $\mathbf{Q}^j$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\mathbf{Q}^j}(u') &= c \mathbf{E} e^{\mathbf{z} \langle \xi', u' \rangle - \mathbf{z} \xi_j \sum u'_k + \xi_j} \\ &= c \varphi_{\xi}((u'_1, \dots, u'_{j-1}, -\sum u'_k - \mathbf{z}, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n)), \end{aligned}$$

where u' is $(n-1)$ -dimensional vector with coordinates numbered excluding j . Assuming for notational convenience that $i < j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\mathbf{Q}^j}(u' - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2} e_i) &= c \varphi_{\xi}((u'_1, \dots, u'_{i-1}, u'_i - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2}, \\ &\quad u'_{i+1}, \dots, u'_{j-1}, -\sum u'_k - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2}, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\mathbf{Q}^j}(K_i^{\top} u' - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2} e_i) &= c \varphi_{\xi}((u'_1, \dots, u'_{i-1}, -\sum u'_k - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2}, \\ &\quad u'_{i+1}, \dots, u'_{j-1}, u'_i - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2}, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n)). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\xi}((u'_1, \dots, u'_{i-1}, u'_i, u'_{i+1}, \dots, u'_{j-1}, -\sum u'_k, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n) - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2} e_{ij}) \\ = \varphi_{\xi}((u'_1, \dots, u'_{i-1}, -\sum u'_k, u'_{i+1}, \dots, u'_{j-1}, u'_i, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n) - \mathbf{z} \frac{1}{2} e_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that all n -dimensional vectors

$$u = (u'_1, \dots, u'_{i-1}, u'_i, u'_{i+1}, \dots, u'_{j-1}, -\sum u'_k, u'_{j+1}, \dots, u'_n)$$

are exactly those that belong to the hyperplane $\mathbb{H}$, whence (3.3) immediately follows. $\square$

The introduced swap-invariance concept relies on invariance properties of payoff function f_b^o from (1.3). It is also possible to modify this payoff function by introducing a positive weight given by a random variable e^{ζ} . A random vector η is called *weighted ij -swap-invariant* if $e^{\zeta} \eta$ is integrable and

$$\mathbf{E}(e^{\zeta} f_b^o(u)) = \mathbf{E}(e^{\zeta} f_b^o(\pi_{ij}(u))) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In this case we write $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$. This concept in particular includes *quanto*-swap options.

Theorem 3.6. Let $\eta = e^\xi$ be a random vector and let e^ζ be an integrable random variable such that $e^\zeta \eta$ is integrable. Then $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$ if and only if the characteristic function of ξ under the measure $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ given by

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}{d\mathbf{Q}} = \frac{e^\zeta}{\mathbf{E}e^\zeta} \quad (3.5)$$

satisfies

$$\varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(u - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij}) = \varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(\pi_{ij}u - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij}) \quad (3.6)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$, see (3.4).

Proof. It suffices to note that $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$ under $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if η is ij -swap-invariant under $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ and refer to Theorem 3.5. $\square$

If the log-weight ζ is given by a linear combination of the logarithm of the assets included in $f_b^\circ(u)$, i.e. $\zeta = \langle \xi, v \rangle$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by changing measure we immediately get the following result.

Corollary 3.7. Let $\eta = e^\xi$ be a random vector such that both e^ξ and $e^\zeta \eta$ are integrable, where $\zeta = \langle v, \xi \rangle$ for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$ if and only if

$$\varphi_\xi(u - \mathbf{i}[\frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + v]) = \varphi_\xi(\pi_{ij}u - \mathbf{i}[\frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + v]) \quad (3.7)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$.

4 Swap-invariance for Lévy models

A random vector ξ has an infinitely divisible distribution if and only if $\xi = L_1$ for a Lévy process L_t , $t \geq 0$, see [25]. In this section we assume that $\eta = e^\xi$ with ξ being infinitely divisible. In the weighted swap-invariance case we additionally require that the vector obtained by concatenating ξ and ζ is also infinitely divisible. For instance, this is the case for quanto-swap options with payoff $\eta_3(u_1\eta_1 + u_2\eta_2)_+$, so that $(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3) = (e^{\xi_1}, e^{\xi_2}, e^\zeta)$, with (ξ_1, ξ_2, ζ) being infinitely divisible.

In the following we need to consider the linear transformation (actually projection), which maps every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ onto the hyperplane $\mathbb{H}$ in the space of dimension n acting as Px with the matrix

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{1}{n} & -\frac{1}{n} & \cdots & -\frac{1}{n} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{n} & 1 - \frac{1}{n} & \cdots & -\frac{1}{n} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -\frac{1}{n} & -\frac{1}{n} & \cdots & 1 - \frac{1}{n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 4.1. Let (ξ, ζ) be infinitely divisible $(n+1)$ -dimensional random vector such that both e^ζ and $e^\zeta \eta$ are integrable with $\eta = e^\xi$. Then $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$ if and only if the characteristic triplet (A, ν, γ) of (ξ, ζ) satisfies the following conditions.

(1) If $n \geq 3$, the matrix A satisfies

$$a_{li} - a_{lj} = \frac{1}{2}(a_{ii} - a_{jj}) \quad (4.2)$$

for all $l \neq i, j, l \leq n$.

(2) The image $\hat{\nu}P^{-1}$ under P of measure

$$d\hat{\nu}(x) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)+x_{n+1}} d\nu(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad (4.3)$$

is π_{ij} -invariant.

(3) γ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i - \gamma_j &= \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) + (a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)}) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (x_j - x_i) (e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)+x_{n+1}} \mathbb{I}_{\|Px\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ be the Esscher transform of $\mathbf{Q}$ with parameter $\frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + e_{n+1}$. Since

$$\varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(u - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij}) = \varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(-\mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij})\varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(u),$$

and

$$\varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(\pi_{ij}u - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij}) = \varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(-\mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}e_{ij})\varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(\pi_{ij}u),$$

condition (3.6) means that the Lévy-Khintchine exponent of ξ under $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is π_{ij} -invariant for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$. The characteristic triplet $(\hat{A}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{\gamma})$ of (ξ, ζ) under $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is given by $\hat{A} = A$, the new Lévy measure $\hat{\nu}$ is given by (4.3), and

$$\hat{\gamma} = \gamma + A(\frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + e_{n+1}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} x(e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)+x_{n+1}} - 1) \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1} d\nu(x), \quad (4.5)$$

see [26, Ex. 7.3] and [25, Th. 25.17] for the related extension of the Lévy-Khintchine formula to the needed subset in the n -dimensional complex plane in view of the imposed integrability conditions.

The π_{ij} -invariance of $\varphi_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}(u)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$ can be rephrased as the π_{ij} -invariance of the distribution for the projection of (ξ, ζ) onto $\mathbb{H}$, equivalently as the ij -exchangeability (under $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$) of the projected (ξ, ζ) . The projection of (ξ, ζ) onto $\mathbb{H}$ has the characteristic triplet (A', ν', γ') , where $A' = P\hat{A}P^{\top} = PAP^{\top}$, ν' is the projection of $\hat{\nu}$ on $\mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$\gamma' = P\hat{\gamma} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} Px(\mathbb{I}_{\|Px\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\hat{\nu}(x), \quad (4.6)$$

see [25, Prop. 11.10]. The elements of A' can be calculated as

$$a'_{ij} = a_{ij} - \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ki} + \sum_{k=1}^n a_{kj} \right) + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k,l=1}^n a_{lk}.$$

Since the projection of (ξ, ζ) is ij -exchangeable, Proposition 2.1(1) requires that $a'_{ii} = a'_{jj}$, so that

$$a_{ii} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} = a_{jj} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n a_{jk}. \quad (4.7)$$

Furthermore, $a'_{li} = a'_{lj}$ for $l \neq i, j$ yields (4.2), which also always satisfies (4.7).

By Proposition 2.1(2), ν' has to be symmetric with respect to π_{ij} . Finally, $\gamma'_i = \gamma'_j$ by Proposition 2.1(3). By combining (4.6) with (4.5) we arrive at Statement (3). $\square$

If both ξ and ζ are integrable under $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$, then the truncation function $\mathbb{I}_{\|\cdot\| \leq 1}$ in the Lévy-Khintchine representation and in (4.4) can be replaced by constant one. If ζ is given by a linear combination of the log-prices for the assets included in $f_b^o(u)$, then it is possible to impose conditions only on the characteristic triplet of ξ .

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\eta = e^\xi$ be an n -dimensional random vector such that ξ is infinitely divisible and both $e^{\langle v, \xi \rangle}$ and $e^{\langle v, \xi \rangle} \eta$ are integrable for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\langle v, \xi \rangle)$ if and only if the characteristic triplet (A, ν, γ) of ξ satisfies the following conditions.*

(1) *If $n \geq 3$, the matrix A satisfies*

$$a_{li} - a_{lj} = \frac{1}{2}(a_{ii} - a_{jj}) \quad (4.8)$$

for all $l \neq i, j$.

(2) *The orthogonal projection of measure*

$$d\bar{\nu}(x) = e^{\langle \frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + v, x \rangle} d\nu(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (4.9)$$

on $\mathbb{H}$ is π_{ij} -invariant, i.e. $\bar{\nu}(B \oplus \mathbb{H}^\perp) = \bar{\nu}(\pi_{ij}B \oplus \mathbb{H}^\perp)$ for all Borel $B \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$, where $\mathbb{H}^\perp$ is the orthogonal complement to $\mathbb{H}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\oplus$ is the direct sum.

(3) *γ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i - \gamma_j &= \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) + \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{jk} - a_{ik})v_k \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x_j - x_i) (e^{\langle \frac{1}{2}e_{ij} + v, x \rangle} \mathbb{I}_{\|P'x\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where P' is P with the last column omitted.

Proof. It suffices to check the conditions (1), (2), and (3) of Theorem 4.1 for the characteristic triplet $(A^\#, \nu^\#, \gamma^\#)$ of (ξ, ζ) . Note that it is possible to write $(\xi, \zeta) = (\xi, \langle v, \xi \rangle)$ as the image of a linear transformation of ξ , represented by the $(n+1) \times n$ -matrix $M = (m_{kl})_{k,l=1}^{(n+1),n}$ with

$m_{kk} = 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$, $m_{(n+1)k} = v_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, with all remaining entries being 0. By [25, Prop. 11.10] $A^\# = MAM^\top$, $\nu^\# = \nu M^{-1}$, and

$$\gamma^\# = M\gamma + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Mx(\mathbb{I}_{\|Mx\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1})\nu(dx). \quad (4.11)$$

A direct computation of matrix products shows that the entries $a_{kl}^\#$, $k, l = 1, \dots, n$, of $A^\#$ are equal to those of A , so that (4.8) is indeed equivalent to (4.2). Furthermore, by changing variables in

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{\nu}^\#(x) &= e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)+x_{n+1}} d\nu^\#(x), \\ d\bar{\nu}(x) &= e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)+\langle v, x \rangle} d\nu(x) \end{aligned}$$

and noticing that $\nu^\# = \nu M^{-1}$ and $PM = P'$, we see that $\hat{\nu}^\# P^{-1}$ coincides with $\bar{\nu}(P')^{-1}$, i.e. the second condition of Theorem 4.2 follows from the corresponding condition in Theorem 4.1. Finally, by combining (4.11) with condition (3) of Theorem 4.1, changing variables, and using

$$a_{k(n+1)}^\# = \sum_{l=1}^n a_{kl} v_l, \quad k = i, j \quad (\neq (n+1)),$$

we arrive at (4.10). □

In the absence of weighting $\zeta = 0$ almost surely and the statements of Theorem 4.2 hold with $v = 0$, i.e. the conditions on A remain unchanged while $d\bar{\nu}(x) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)} d\nu(x)$ and (4.10) turns into

$$\gamma_i - \gamma_j = \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x_j - x_i)(e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i+x_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\|P'x\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x). \quad (4.12)$$

The following theorem deals with the particularly important risk-neutral non-weighted case.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\eta = e^\xi$ be an n -dimensional random vector with expectation one in all components such that ξ is infinitely divisible. Then η is ij -swap-invariant if and only if the characteristic triplet (A, ν, γ) of ξ satisfies the first two conditions of Theorem 4.2 (for $v = 0$).*

Proof. Since $1 = \mathbf{E}\eta_l = \varphi_\xi^\mathbf{Q}(-\imath e_l)$,

$$\gamma_l + \frac{1}{2}a_{ll} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (e^{x_l} - 1 - x_l \mathbb{I}_{\|x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x) = 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, n. \quad (4.13)$$

In this case (4.12) turns into

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i-x_j)} - e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_j-x_i)} + (x_j - x_i) \mathbb{I}_{\|P'x\| \leq 1}) d\bar{\nu}(x) = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

Changing variable as $x = w' + w''$ with $w' \in \mathbb{H}$ and $w'' \in \mathbb{H}^\perp$ and noticing that $\mathbb{H}^\perp = \{t \mathbf{1} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ consists of vectors with all equal components, the integral turns into an integral over $\mathbb{H}$ with respect to the projection of $\bar{\nu}$ onto $\mathbb{H}$. The integrand changes the sign if x is replaced by $\pi_{ij}x$, while the projected measure $\bar{\nu}$ is invariant under this change. Thus, the whole integral vanishes. $\square$

Note that it suffices to assume that η is integrable with $\mathbf{E}\eta_i = \mathbf{E}\eta_j = 1$.

Remark 4.4 (Risk-neutral case with a weight). By using the same argument as in Theorem 4.3 in the risk-neutral case condition (4.4) can be replaced by

$$a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_i - x_j) - x_{n+1}} - e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_j - x_i) - x_{n+1}} + (x_j - x_i) \mathbb{I}_{\|Px\| \leq 1}) d\hat{\nu}(x) = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

In the finite mean-case (under both $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$) the truncation function in the Lévy-Khintchine representation and in (4.15) can be replaced by constant one.

Example 4.5 (Geometric Brownian motion). If the Lévy measure vanishes, then the first condition of Theorem 4.1 remains the same, the second condition is void, while the third one becomes (with μ written instead of γ)

$$\mu_i - \mu_j = \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) + (a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)}).$$

In the risk-neutral case this condition means that $a_{j(n+1)} = a_{i(n+1)}$, so in the non-weighted risk-neutral case only the first condition of Theorem 4.1 is imposed.

In particular, *each bivariate* risk-neutral log-normal distribution is (non-weighted) swap-invariant, no matter what volatilities of the assets and correlation are. In the non-weighted risk-neutral case with $n = 3$ and $i = 1, j = 2$ the only condition is

$$a_{31} - a_{32} = \frac{1}{2}(a_{11} - a_{22}).$$

In the presence of a weight, for $n = 2$ the only condition in the risk-neutral case is $a_{13} = a_{23}$, which guarantees the quanto-swap-invariance property

$$\mathbf{E}e^\zeta(u_1\eta_1 + u_2\eta_2)_+ = \mathbf{E}e^\zeta(u_2\eta_1 + u_1\eta_2)_+, \quad (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

In a special case when the weight is given by the price of one of the assets included in the swap (e.g. $\zeta = \xi_2$), the equality of a_{13} and a_{23} yields that $a_{12} = a_{22}$.

In case of three assets under risk-neutral measure and with the weight determined by the assets included in $f_b^o(u)$ we have $\eta \in \text{WS}_{12}(\xi_3)$ if and only if Theorem 4.2 applies with $v = e_3$. This is the case if both $a_{11} = a_{22}$ and $a_{13} = a_{23}$, i.e. in the 12-exchangeable case. In general, for higher-dimensional risk-neutral geometric Brownian motion $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\xi_k)$ with $k \neq i, j$ implies ij -exchangeability, since (4.10) simplifies to $a_{jk} - a_{ik} = 0$, i.e. $a_{jk} = a_{ik}$, so that by (4.8) for $l = k$ we have $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$. By (4.8) for $l \neq i, j$ and using $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$ we arrive at $a_{li} = a_{lj}$ for all $l = 1, \dots, n, l \neq i, j$ (along with $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$), i.e. A satisfies Proposition 2.1(1). In the risk-neutral geometric Brownian motion setting $a_{ii} = a_{jj}$ also implies that $\mu_i = \mu_j$, so that all conditions in Proposition 2.1 are satisfied.

Remark 4.6 (Lévy measures). The image of the Lévy measure $\hat{\nu}$ under P (resp. the projection of $\bar{\nu}$ on $\mathbb{H}$) is π_{ij} -invariant if (but not only if) the Lévy measure $\hat{\nu}$ (resp. $\bar{\nu}$) is π_{ij} -invariant itself. Simple example of Lévy measures satisfying Theorem 4.1(2) (resp. Theorem 4.2(2)) can be constructed by taking an $(n+1)$ -dimensional (resp. n -dimensional) ij -exchangeable (i.e. π_{ij} -invariant) Lévy measure $\tilde{\nu}$ (resp. $\bar{\nu}$) satisfying (2.2) and defining ν from (4.3) or (4.9) given that the imposed integrability assumptions on η and $e^\zeta \eta$ are satisfied. Examples for $\tilde{\nu}$ and $\bar{\nu}$ can be constructed by taking centred normal distributions with covariance matrix satisfying the condition in Proposition 2.1(1).

Example 4.7 (Two-asset case). In the bivariate non-weighted infinitely divisible (Lévy) case the first condition of Theorem 4.2 is void. The second condition holds, e.g. for exchangeable ν , while the third one always holds in the risk-neutral setting.

Remark 4.8 (Square integrable case and covariance). Condition (1) in Theorem 4.1 (resp. Theorem 4.2) yields a certain restriction on the correlation structure coming from the centred Gaussian term for $n \geq 3$, while for $n = 2$ there are no restrictions. In order to relax the restrictions also for higher-dimensional models, it is useful to introduce a jump component. Assume that $\int_{\|x\|>1} \|x\|^2 d\nu(x) < \infty$, i.e. (ξ, ζ) (resp. ξ) is square-integrable. Then the covariance matrix of (ξ, ζ) (resp. ξ) has elements

$$\Sigma_{lj} = \left(a_{lj} + \int x_l x_j d\nu(x) \right), \quad l, j = 1, \dots, n+1, \quad (\text{resp. } l, j = 1, \dots, n),$$

where the integral is over the Euclidean space of appropriate dimension, see [25, Ex. 25.12]. Thus, despite of some constraints on the Lévy measure given in Theorem 4.1 (resp. Theorem 4.2), there is more flexibility in modelling of the correlation structure for $\eta \in \text{WS}_{ij}(\zeta)$.

Some specific dependency structures have particular influence on the marginal distributions. For instance, if η is ij -swap-invariant with η_i being independent of η_k for some $k \neq i, j$, then $\eta_i = \eta_j$ almost surely. Indeed, then η_k/η_j and η_i/η_j are independent under $\mathbf{Q}^j$, which by [23] implies that $\eta_i/\eta_j = 1$ almost surely under $\mathbf{Q}^j$.

By interpreting (ξ, ζ) (resp. ξ) as time one value of a Lévy process we arrive at the following result.

Corollary 4.9. *If (ξ_t, ζ_t) (resp. ξ_t), $t \geq 0$, is the Lévy process with generating triplet (A, ν, γ) that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.1 (resp. Theorem 4.2), then (e^{ξ_t}, e^{ζ_t}) (resp. e^{ξ_t}) is weighted ij -swap-invariant for all $t \geq 0$.*

Remark 4.10 (Random times). Consider a family $\{\eta(t), t \geq 0\}$ of (weighted) ij -swap-invariant random vectors. If $\tau_t, t \geq 0$, is an increasing non-negative random function independent of η , then the time-changed stochastic process $\eta(\tau_t), t \geq 0$, consist of swap-invariant random variables.

5 Quasi-swap-invariance

In some cases the swap-invariance condition is too restrictive, in particular, its relaxed variant is useful to adjust for *unequal* carrying costs. We say that η is *quasi-swap-invariant* if

$$\mathbf{E}[e^\zeta f_b^\circ(u)] = \mathbf{E}\left[e^\zeta f_b^\circ(\pi_{ij}(u))\left(\frac{\eta_i}{\eta_j}\right)^\alpha\right] \quad (5.1)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In order to avoid trivial situations, we assume that all mentioned expectations exist. By passing to the new probability measure $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j$ defined by

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j}{d\mathbf{Q}} = \frac{e^\zeta \eta_j}{\mathbf{E}(e^\zeta \eta_j)},$$

assuming the $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j$ -integrability of $\tilde{\kappa}_j(\eta)$ and using [23] it is easy to see that (5.1) is equivalent to the fact that $\tilde{\kappa}_j(\eta)^{\alpha+1}$ is self-dual with respect to the i th numeraire under $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j$. Random vectors that become self-dual if raised to some power are called *quasi-self-dual* in [23]. It follows from [23] that an analogue of Theorem 3.4 holds with (3.2) replaced by

$$\varphi_\xi^{\mathbf{P}}\left(u - \mathbf{z} \frac{\alpha+1}{2} e_i\right) = \varphi_\xi^{\mathbf{P}}\left(K_i^\top u - \mathbf{z} \frac{\alpha+1}{2} e_i\right).$$

Similarly to Theorem 3.5, it is possible to show that η is quasi-swap-invariant if and only if the characteristic function of ξ under $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j$ satisfies

$$\varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j}(u - \mathbf{z} \frac{\alpha+1}{2} (e_i - e_j)) = \varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^j}(\pi_{ij} u - \mathbf{z} \frac{\alpha+1}{2} (e_i - e_j))$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$, or, equivalently, the characteristic function under $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ from (3.5) satisfies

$$\varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(u - \mathbf{z} [\frac{1+\alpha}{2} e_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2} e_j]) = \varphi_\xi^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(\pi_{ij} u - \mathbf{z} [\frac{1+\alpha}{2} e_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2} e_j]) \quad (5.2)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$. Similarly to the quasi-swap-invariance definition, the latter condition is no longer symmetric with respect to the order of i and j .

Condition (5.2) can be rephrased as (3.6) with ζ replaced by

$$\zeta' = \frac{\alpha}{2}(\xi_i - \xi_j) + \zeta, \quad (5.3)$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\xi_i + \xi_j) + \zeta' = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\xi_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\xi_j + \zeta.$$

Thus, in the infinite divisible case the quasi-swap-invariance holds if and only if conditions of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied with (ξ, ζ) replaced by (ξ, ζ') given above. Interpreting (ξ, ζ) as the linear transform of (ξ, ζ') and looking at the transformed Lévy triplet, we see that condition (1) remains unchanged, the image measure of $\hat{\nu}$ under P is π_{ij} -invariant, where

$$d\hat{\nu}(x) = e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j + x_{n+1}} d\nu(x),$$

and γ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i - \gamma_j &= \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) - \frac{\alpha}{2}(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}) + (a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)}) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (x_j - x_i) \left(e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j + x_{n+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\|Px\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq 1} \right) d\nu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

For some applications, notably for semi-static hedging of barrier options with unequal carrying costs, the symmetry should be imposed on price changes adjusted with carrying costs. Unlike equity markets, where the assumption of equal carrying costs is often not totally unrealistic (e.g. in dividend-free cases), this assumption is quite restrictive in currency markets, since the risk-free interest rates in different countries usually differ. The carrying costs on various assets amount to componentwise multiplication of η by a vector $e^\lambda = (e^{\lambda_1}, \dots, e^{\lambda_n})$, where $\lambda_i = r - r_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In currency trading r_i denotes the risk-free interest rate in the i th foreign market, while in the share case it becomes the dividend yield of the i th share. If useful, λ can also have other interpretations than being the pure carrying costs and η need not be a one-period martingale itself. If imposed, the martingale assumption will be explicitly mentioned.

Multiplying η with a vector representing unequal carrying costs tends to affect the (weighted) ij -swap-invariance property. But in some cases (5.1) holds, e.g. for all risk-neutral bivariate log-normal models, where η multiplied by unequal carrying costs is clearly not ij -swap-invariant anymore but satisfies (5.1) with $e^\zeta = 1$ and $\alpha = 2(r_i - r_j)(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij})^{-1}$, see Example 5.2.

If $\eta = e^{\xi+\lambda}$ is quasi-swap-invariant, then $\xi + \lambda$ instead of ξ satisfies (5.2), i.e. ξ under $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ satisfies

$$\varphi_{\xi}^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(u - \mathbf{z}[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}e_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}e_j]) = \varphi_{\xi}^{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}}(\pi_{ij}u - \mathbf{z}[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}e_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}e_j])e^{\mathbf{z}(r_i - r_j)(u_i - u_j)}$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{H}$. In the infinitely divisible case the Lévy triplet of $(\xi + \lambda, \zeta)$ satisfies the derived conditions for quasi-swap-invariant Lévy triplets. The conditions on the diffusion matrix A and the Lévy measure in the Lévy triplet of (ξ, ζ) remain identical, while (5.4) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i - \gamma_j &= \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) - \frac{\alpha}{2}(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}) + (a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)}) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (x_j - x_i) \left(e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j + x_{n+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\|Px\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq 1} \right) d\nu(x) + r_i - r_j. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Note that the swap-invariance conditions only depend on the carrying costs of the i th and j th assets, notably they do not depend on carrying costs included in the weight.

It is not difficult to see that if $e^{\xi+\lambda}$ satisfies (5.1) for vanishing ζ , the first condition on the Lévy triplet of ξ is identical to the first condition in Theorem 4.2, the orthogonal projection on $\mathbb{H}$ of n -dimensional measure $\bar{\nu}$ given by

$$\bar{\nu}(x) = e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j} d\nu(x)$$

is π_{ij} -invariant and γ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_i - \gamma_j &= \frac{1}{2}(a_{jj} - a_{ii}) - \frac{\alpha}{2}(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x_j - x_i) \left(e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j} \mathbb{1}_{\|P'x\| \leq 1} - \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| \leq 1} \right) d\nu(x) + r_i - r_j.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1 (Determining α from the Lévy triplet and the carrying costs). Note that neither (weighted) ij -swap invariance nor the more general quasi- ij -swap invariance condition (5.1) imply $\mathbf{E}e^{\xi_j} = 1$. Thus, for many applications one need to additionally assume that $\mathbf{E}e^{\xi_l} = 1$ for all $l = 1, \dots, n$. Consider $\eta = e^{\xi+\lambda}$ that satisfies (5.1) with given λ and such that (ξ, ζ) is infinitely divisible.

Combine (5.5) with the $(n+1)$ -dimensional version of (4.13) to see that α satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}) &= 2(r_i - r_j) + 2(a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)}) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} (e^{x_i} - e^{x_j} + (x_j - x_i) e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j + x_{n+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\|Px\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x).\end{aligned}\quad (5.6)$$

For vanishing ζ the condition can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}) &= 2(r_i - r_j) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (e^{x_i} - e^{x_j} + (x_j - x_i) e^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}x_i + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}x_j} \mathbb{1}_{\|P'x\| \leq 1}) d\nu(x).\end{aligned}$$

In the Lévy processes setting the values of α calculated from the distributions at any time moment $t \geq 0$ coincide.

Example 5.2 (Black–Scholes setting). In the absence of jumps it is possible to explicitly derive α from (5.6). Namely, if ν vanishes and A satisfies (5.6) with $a_{ii} + a_{jj} \neq 2a_{ij}$, then

$$\alpha = 2 \frac{a_{j(n+1)} - a_{i(n+1)} + r_i - r_j}{a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}}, \quad (5.7)$$

which in the non-weighted case simplifies to

$$\alpha = \frac{2(r_i - r_j)}{a_{ii} + a_{jj} - 2a_{ij}}.$$

In the bivariate Black–Scholes case this result has been derived in [27] by directly analysing a slightly generalised version of the Margrabe formula. Section 6 shows that this result can be used for semi-statically hedging certain slightly generalised swap-options in certain (in the bivariate case all) Black–Scholes economies.

Example 5.2 demonstrates that turning to the more general quasi-swap-invariance concept also in the equal carrying cost case ($r_i = r_j$) yields considerably more flexibility for modelling the asset prices. In particular each three-asset Black–Scholes model is quasi-quanto-swap-invariant with α determined from (5.7).

For certain applications also the relation of the just analysed conditions to other symmetry results in real existing dual-markets can be useful, see [27]. Assume that in a risk-neutral setting (5.1) holds for $\eta = e^{\lambda+\xi}$ with vanishing ζ . Consider measure $d\mathbf{Q}^j = e^{\xi_j} d\mathbf{Q}$ with $\mathbf{E}e^{\xi_j} = 1$. Then $(e^{\tilde{\lambda}+\tilde{\xi}})^{\alpha+1}$ with $\tilde{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_n) - \xi_j \mathbf{1}$, is self-dual with respect to the i th numeraire under $\mathbf{Q}^j$, i.e. $\tilde{\kappa}_j(e^\xi) = e^{\tilde{\xi}}$ is quasi-self-dual of order $(\alpha+1)$ under $\mathbf{Q}^j$ with respect to the i th numeraire. For a detailed presentation of quasi-self-duality we refer to [23]. Note that in currency trading $\tilde{\lambda} = (r_j - r_1, \dots, r_j - r_{j-1}, r_j - r_{j+1}, \dots, r_j - r_n)$ can be interpreted as the carrying costs related to $\tilde{\kappa}_j(e^\xi) = e^{\tilde{\xi}}$ in the j th foreign market, while $\mathbf{Q}^j$ has the interpretation of the martingale measure of the j th foreign market corresponding to $\mathbf{Q}$.

6 Hedging multi-asset barrier options

In this section we show how the analysed symmetry properties can be used to create semi-static hedging strategies for several popular multi-asset options. First we apply ij -exchangeability property for creating robust hedges of certain weighted spread- and weighted quanto-spread options with knocking conditions. After that bivariate swap-invariance and quasi-swap-invariance is used for creating semi-static hedges of some weighted swap options. Finally, weighted ij -swap-invariance is applied for replicating weighted quanto-swap options all equipped with knocking conditions.

Before starting we would like to point out that the subsequent hedging strategies are only practicable provided that the considered claims are liquid or can be replicated by liquid instruments. However, there is a fast growing literature about sub- and super-replication of several of the used instruments in the subsequent examples, see e.g. [22] and the literature cited therein. Sometimes it is also possible to increase the liquidity of the used instruments by implementing the hedges in a foreign derivative market, similarly to [27].

We will assume in all examples without loss of generality that $i = 1$ and $j = 2$, and so accordingly speak about 12-exchangeability or 12-swap-invariance.

Example 6.1 (Hedges based on the exchangeability property). Assume that the vector of asset prices

$$S_t = (S_{t1}, S_{t2}, S_{t3}) = (S_{01}e^{\lambda_1 t} \eta_{t1}, S_{02}e^{\lambda_2 t} \eta_{t2}, S_{03}e^{\lambda_3 t} \eta_{t3}) = S_0 \circ e^{\xi_t + \lambda t}$$

with

$$\eta_t = (\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}, \eta_{t3}) = (e^{\xi_{t1}}, e^{\xi_{t2}}, e^{\xi_{t3}}) = e^{\xi_t}, \quad \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3),$$

being 12-exchangeable for all $t \in [0, T]$, where the components of the (square-integrable) η_t , $t \in [0, T]$, are exponential Lévy processes and $\mathbf{Q}$ -martingales (defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, (\mathfrak{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbf{Q})$ where the filtration $(\mathfrak{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the usual conditions). Let the carrying costs $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ be the same for the first and the second assets, e.g. both being the risk-free interest rate. Assume $S_{01} > S_{02}$ and define the stopping time $\tau = \inf\{t : S_{t1} \leq S_{t2}\}$ and the corresponding stopping σ -algebra $\mathfrak{F}_\tau$. Consider the claim

$$X_{\text{qsp}} = S_{T3} (aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ \mathbb{1}_{S_{t1} > S_{t2} \forall t \in [0, T]}, \quad (6.1)$$

where $k \geq 0$, $0 < a \leq b$. This option is knocked out if the price of the first asset becomes smaller than or equal to the price of the second one.

We assume for a moment that jumps cannot cross the barrier, e.g. being the case in the Black–Scholes setting. Then we can hedge the claim X_{qsp} by taking the following positions in the European weighted quanto-spread options

$$\begin{aligned} \text{long} \quad & S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+, \\ \text{short} \quad & S_{T3}(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1} - k)_+. \end{aligned}$$

To see that note, that since ξ_t is a Lévy process, (ξ_τ, ξ_T) and $(\xi_\tau, \xi_\tau + \xi'_{T-\tau})$ share the same distribution on the event $\{\tau \leq T\}$, where ξ'_t , $t \in [0, T]$, is an independent copy of the process ξ_t , $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, (S_τ, S_T) and $(S_\tau, S_\tau \circ e^{\xi'_{T-\tau} + \lambda(T-\tau)})$ also coincide in distribution. Thus, by applying the *ij*-exchangeability together with Remark 4.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ | \mathfrak{F}_\tau] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[S_{\tau 3}e^{\xi'_{(T-\tau)3} + \lambda_3(T-\tau)}(aS_{\tau 1}e^{\lambda_1(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)1}} - bS_{\tau 2}e^{\lambda_2(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)2}} - k)_+ | S_\tau] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[S_{\tau 3}e^{\xi'_{(T-\tau)3} + \lambda_3(T-\tau)}(-bS_{\tau 2}e^{\lambda_2(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)1}} + aS_{\tau 1}e^{\lambda_1(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)2}} - k)_+ | S_\tau] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[S_{\tau 3}e^{\xi'_{(T-\tau)3} + \lambda_3(T-\tau)}(aS_{\tau 2}e^{\lambda_2(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)2}} - bS_{\tau 1}e^{\lambda_1(T-\tau) + \xi'_{(T-\tau)1}} - k)_+ | S_\tau] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[S_{T3}(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1} - k)_+ | \mathfrak{F}_\tau] \end{aligned}$$

on the event $\{\tau \leq T\}$. Hence, whenever the spots of the two assets are equal before T , the values of the two derivatives in the hedge portfolio are equal and we can liquidate the hedge portfolio of the knocked-out option for free. On the event that $\{\tau > T\}$, the long position in the hedging portfolio of the claim X_{qsp} gives the desired terminal payoff and the written position expires worthless, since $S_{T2} < S_{T1}$ and $0 < a \leq b$.

Of course, the above considerations also yield that the knock-in claim

$$Y_{\text{qsp}} = S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ \mathbb{I}_{\tau \leq T}, \quad 0 < a \leq b, \quad k \geq 0,$$

can be hedged with a long position in the European option given by the payoff function

$$S_{T3}(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1} - k)_+.$$

In case of jump processes the exchangeability implies that η_1 has non-problematic up (problematic down) jumps if and only if η_2 has problematic up (non-problematic down) jumps, so that $S_{\tau 1}$ is no longer almost surely equal $S_{\tau 2}$. This fact leads to a super-replication of knock-in options and a more problematic sub-replication of knock-out options.

If the knock-out condition is changed, we also have to change the replication portfolio, e.g. a modification of the claim X_{qsp} given by

$$S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ \mathbb{I}_{cS_{t1} > S_{t2} \forall t \in [0, T]}$$

(with $0 < a \leq bc$, $b, c \geq 0$, and other assumptions unchanged) should still be hedged with the long position contained in the hedge portfolio for X_{qsp} , while the short position in this case is given by the European derivative defined by the payoff function

$$S_{T3} \left(\frac{a}{c} S_{T2} - bc S_{T1} - k \right)_+.$$

By changing S_{T3} to constant one in X_{qsp} , Y_{qsp} we obtain certain weighted barrier spread options with knocking conditions given by the claims

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\text{sp}} &= (aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ \mathbb{1}_{S_{t1} > S_{t2} \forall t \in [0, T]}, & k \geq 0, \\ Y_{\text{sp}} &= (aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T}, & k \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

having hedge portfolios containing a long position in the weighted European spread option given by the payoff function $(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2} - k)_+$ and a short position in the spread option with payoff $(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1} - k)_+$ (for X_{sp}), respectively a long position in the weighted European spread option given by $(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1} - k)_+$ (for Y_{sp}). If $a = b = 1$, we end up with hedging portfolios containing only European standard spread options.

Remark 6.2. Extensions for independently time-changed Lévy processes are possible by means of conditioning arguments described in [11, Th. 4.2, 5.4]. Further models without jumps can be obtained on the basis of the multivariate Black-Scholes model with characteristics described in Example 2.3 by applying independent common stochastic clocks being continuous with respect to calendar time.

Example 6.3 (Barrier swap-options). By further specialising the claims X_{sp} and Y_{sp} to the cases where $k = 0$ (with other assumptions unchanged) we get weighted barrier swap (also known as Margrabe) options with knocking conditions, defined by the following claims

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\text{sw}} &= (aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+ \mathbb{1}_{S_{t1} > S_{t2} \forall t \in [0, T]}, \\ Y_{\text{sw}} &= (aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+ \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T}. \end{aligned}$$

In that case we can reformulate the whole arguments by only assuming (η_{t1}, η_{t2}) to be swap-invariant, to see that the hedging portfolio for X_{sw} contains a long position in the weighted swap option with payoff function $(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+$ along with a short position in the swap option with payoff function $(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1})_+$. The later instrument is at the same time the needed long position for hedging Y_{sw} .

In order to get hedges for the claims X_{sw} and Y_{sw} in the different carrying cost case based on quasi-swap-invariant models, i.e. Lévy models with triplets satisfying the conditions derived in Section 5, we can use (5.1) for $\eta = e^{\xi_t + \lambda t}$ (with $\zeta = 0$) to confirm that X_{sw} can be hedged with a long position in the European derivative with payoff $(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+$ (as in the equal carrying cost case) and a short position in the European derivative with payoff function

$$(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1})_+ \left(\frac{S_{T1}}{S_{T2}} \right)^\alpha, \quad (6.2)$$

the latter being the long position for hedging Y_{sw} . The same hedging strategies are also needed if flexible quasi-swap-invariant models are used in equal carrying cost cases.

Example 6.4 (Barrier quanto-swap options). If the exchangeability assumption in the three asset setting of Example 6.1 is replaced by the weaker weighted 12-swap invariance property with weight e^ζ given by $S_{T3} = S_{03}e^\zeta$, then we can still rely on the same ideas for getting robust hedging strategies for the claims given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\text{qsw}} &= S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+ \mathbb{I}_{S_{t1} > S_{t2} \forall t \in [0, T]}, & 0 < a \leq b, \\ Y_{\text{qsw}} &= S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+ \mathbb{I}_{\tau \leq T}, & 0 < a \leq b. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding hedge portfolios contain a long position in the European derivative given by the payoff function $S_{T3}(aS_{T1} - bS_{T2})_+$ (a weighted quanto-swap) and a short position in the European derivative with payoff $S_{T3}(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1})_+$ (for X_{qsw}), respectively a long position in the European derivative given by $S_{T3}(aS_{T2} - bS_{T1})_+$ (for Y_{qsw}). In order to get hedges for the claims X_{qsw} and Y_{qsw} in the different carrying cost case, or if quasi-swap-invariant models are needed for modelling equal carrying cost cases, one can again use the corresponding models analysed in Section 5.

References

- [1] Aldous, D.J.: Exchangeability and Related Topics, *Lect. Notes Math.*, vol. 1117. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1985)
- [2] Andersen, L.B.G., Andreasen, J., Eliezer, D.: Static replication of barrier options: some general results. *J. Comput. Finance* **5**, 1–25 (2002)
- [3] Andreasen, J.: Behind the mirror. *Risk* **14**, 108–110 (2001)
- [4] Bates, D.S.: The crash of '87 — was it expected? The evidence from options markets. *J. Finance* **46**, 1009–1044 (1991)
- [5] Bates, D.S.: The skewness premium: Option pricing under asymmetric processes. *Advances in Futures and Options Research* **9**, 51–82 (1997)
- [6] Breeden, D.T., Litzenberger, R.H.: Prices of state-contingent claims implicit in options prices. *J. of Business* **51**, 621–651 (1978)
- [7] Carr, P.: European put call symmetry. Tech. rep., Cornell University (1994)
- [8] Carr, P., Chou, A.: Breaking barriers. *Risk* **10**, 139–145 (1997)
- [9] Carr, P., Chou, A.: Hedging complex barrier options (2002). Working paper, NYU's Courant Institute and Enuviv Inc.
- [10] Carr, P., Ellis, K., Gupta, V.: Static hedging of exotic options. *J. Finance* **53**, 1165–1190 (1998)

- [11] Carr, P., Lee, R.: Put-call symmetry: extensions and applications. *Math. Finance* (2009). [Http://www.math.nyu.edu/research/carrp/papers/pdf/PCSR22.pdf](http://www.math.nyu.edu/research/carrp/papers/pdf/PCSR22.pdf)
- [12] Eberlein, E., Papapantoleon, A., Shiryaev, A.N.: On the duality principle in option pricing: semimartingale setting. *Finance and Stochastics* **12**, 265–292 (2008)
- [13] Eberlein, E., Papapantoleon, A., Shiryaev, A.N.: Esscher transform and the duality principle for multidimensional semimartingales. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* (2009). To appear. Arxiv math.PR/0809.0301
- [14] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: A note on pricing, duality and symmetry for two dimensional Lévy markets. In: Y. Kabanov, R. Liptser, J. Stoyanov (eds.) *From Stochastic Analysis to Mathematical Finance — Festschrift for A.N. Shiryaev*, pp. 249–256. Springer, New York (2006)
- [15] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: Pricing derivatives on two dimensional Lévy processes. *Int. J. Theoret. Appl. Finance* **9**, 185–197 (2006)
- [16] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: Skewness premium with Lévy processes (2006). Working paper, IBMEC
- [17] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: Symmetry and duality in Lévy markets. *Quant. Finance* **6**, 219–227 (2006)
- [18] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: Duality and derivative pricing with time-changed lévy processes. *Brazilian Review of Econometrics* **28**, 95–110 (2008)
- [19] Fajardo, J., Mordecki, E.: Symmetry and time change Brownian motions (2008). Arxiv math.PR/0810.4271
- [20] Grabbe, O.: The pricing of call and put options on foreign exchange. *J. Int. Money and Finance* **2**, 239–253 (1983)
- [21] Kallenberg, O.: *Foundations of Modern Probability*, 2nd edn. Springer, New York (2002)
- [22] Laurence, P., Wang, T.H.: Sharp distribution free lower bounds for spread options and the corresponding optimal subreplicating portfolios. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **44**, 35–47 (2009)
- [23] Molchanov, I., Schmutz, M.: Geometric extension of put-call symmetry in the multiasset setting. Tech. rep., University of Bern, Bern (2008). ArXiv math.PR/0806.4506
- [24] Ross, S.A.: Options and efficiency. *Quart. J. of Economics* **90**, 75–89 (1976)
- [25] Sato, K.: *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1999)

- [26] Sato, K.: Density transformation in Lévy processes (2000). MaPhySto, Lecture Notes, 7
- [27] Schmutz, M.: Semi-static hedging for certain Margrabe type options with barriers. Tech. rep., University of Bern, Bern (2008). ArXiv math.PR/0810.5146